

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, a new abstract is submitted and a replacement sheet showing a new Fig. 2a and Fig. 2b are presented. No new matter is added. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-5 are presented for further prosecution on the merits.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Grill et al. ("Information Technology – very low bit rate audio-visual coding," Part 3: Audio, ISO/IES FCD 14496-3 Subpart 1, May 1998, hereinafter "Grill"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1 and 4 recite, in part:

reading a predetermined amount of audio information from the  
buffer memory in accordance with the preset speed  
magnification

In contrast, Grill discloses, "adjacent waveforms with the same length are extracted in pairs from the buffer memory," at p. 21, paragraph 4.1.3 thereof. Accordingly, it appears that Grill teaches reading audio information (waveforms A and B of Fig. 2a) from the buffer memory. The amount of audio information LW is based on the difference (distortion) between A and B. Thus, grill discloses reading an amount of audio information from the buffer memory in accordance with minimal distortion between parts of the information and not in accordance with the preset speed magnification. Therefore, claims 1 and 4 are patentably distinct over Grill. Specifically,

Grill neither discloses nor suggests reading a predetermined amount of audio information from the buffer memory in accordance with the preset speed magnification, as recited in claims 1 and 4. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grill in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,845,247 to Miyasaka (hereinafter, "Miyasaka"). In making this rejection, the Office Action takes the position that Grill shows an audio reproducing method including all of the limitations of claims 2 and 5, with the exception of rendering the mutually connected second portions to serve as an output for converting a reproducing speed in a second channel and reproducing the audio information independently through the first and second channels.

However, it is respectfully submitted that Grill also fails to disclose or suggest connecting together the first portions and rendering the mutually connected first portions as an output for converting a reproducing speed in a first channel and successively cutting out, in accordance with window functions, second portions of the audio information and connecting together the second portions.

Rather, Grill discloses cutting out first portions of the audio information, waveforms A and B as shown in FIG. 2a. The first portions, waveforms A and B, are linearly overlap added to produce a waveform C. The cut out first portions of the audio information A and B are replaced with waveform C. Then, the beginning of waveform C, consisting of linearly overlap added first portions A and B, is output as the compressed signal. Alternately, if waveform C is shorter than a fixed length output

window, original waveform D, which follows first portions A and B, is output after waveform C.

The Office Action admits that Grill fails to disclose a second channel through which mutually connected second portions are output. It is respectfully submitted that there are no second portions, as Grill fails to disclose successively cutting out, in accordance with window functions, second portions of the audio information. In Grill, after the first portions A and B are cut out, the first portions A and B are linearly overlap added to make C, which is then output. If necessary, D may be output after C. But Grill fails to disclose and/or suggest successively cutting out, in accordance with window functions, second portions of the audio information, connecting together the second portions, and rendering the mutually connected second portions to serve as an output for converting a reproducing speed in a second channel and reproducing the audio information independently through the first and second channels, as recited in claims 2 and 5.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Grill neither discloses nor suggests the above limitation of claims 2 and 5.

The Office Action asserts that Miyasaka discloses the admitted deficiencies of Grill, specifically, rendering the output of the second portions in a second channel 106 of FIG. 1 and reproducing the audio information independently through the first and second channels 105 and 106 of FIG. 1.

However, Miyasaka discloses a method of reproducing audio information in which an audio input signal is first subjected to band division to produce a plurality of band signals. The plurality of band signals are input to a time scale modifier and output

as a plurality of time-axis modified band signals. The time-axis modified band signals are then input to a synthesis filter bank, where they are synthesized to reproduce a time-axis modified version of the original signal.

Thus, the plurality of time-axis modified band signals output from the time-scale modifier blocks 105, 106, 107 (referred to as channels in the outstanding Office Action) of FIG. 1 of Miyasaka are not independent reproductions of the original audio information as asserted in the outstanding Office Action. Rather, the output of the first and second "channels" are time-axis modified band components of the original audio information, when considering the original audio information to be that which is read from the audio information source.

Further, Miyasaka neither discloses nor suggests successively cutting out, in accordance with window functions, first portions of the audio information, connecting together the first portions and rendering the mutually connected first portions as an output for converting a reproducing speed in a first channel, successively cutting out, in accordance with window functions, second portions of the audio information, connecting together the second portions, and rendering the mutually connected second portions as an output for converting a reproducing speed in a second channel, as recited in claims 2 and 5.

Since the cited prior art references, alone or combined, fail to disclose at least these limitations of claims 2 and 5, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 5 are patentably distinct over the combination and in condition for allowance. Further, since claim 3 depends from claim 2, claim 3 is allowable for at least the reasons claim 2 is allowable.

**CONCLUSION**


For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 are patentably distinct over the cited references and in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket number 107156-00061. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket number 107156-00061.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michele L. Connell  
Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372  
ARENT FOX, PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6104  
Fax: (202) 857-6395

MLC/sg

Enclosure: Replacement sheet